INFORMATION LETTER

Not for Publication — **NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION** — For Members Only

No. 1345 — Washington, D. C. — July 14, 1951

Canners' Construction Requirements Sought

The National Canners Association this week mailed to all canners a questionnaire asking for their construction requirements for 1952 to be given in terms of the weight of needed steel, copper, and aluminum forms. The National Production Authority is making plans now for the allotments by quarters of these controlled materials during the calendar year 1952.

It is urged that canners planning construction next year return the questionnaire by July 20. From these forms the Association will tabulate the needs of the canning industry and present the compilation to the Production and Marketing Administration of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, which acts as claimant agency to NPA.

PMA, as claimant for the food industry, will receive an allotment of the controlled materials for distribution to the industry next year. Canners planning construction are advised to submit their needs promptly and as accurately as possible so that the requirements of the canning industry will be met with an accurate and equitable share of the controlled materials.

Crop Loss Allowances on Cherries, Apricots, Peaches

The Office of Price Stabilization announced July 13 that the ceiling price regulation now being prepared for processed sweet cherries, apricots and freestone peaches will reflect increases in the grower prices for these items due to severe crop losses in producing states.

The maximum raw material costs for sweet cherries for canning and freezing and for brining in Washington and Oregon, which, if paid, may be reflected in ceiling prices, will be $368 per ton for canning and freezing and $345 per ton for brining.

The maximum raw material costs for apricots for canning or freezing, which, if paid, may be reflected in ceiling prices, will be $106 per ton in Cali-

(Please turn to page 265)

Ban on Inventory Windfalls Removed

The Office of Price Stabilization has acted to eliminate the provisions in the General Ceiling Price Regulation and Ceiling Price Regulation 22 which restrict processors of agricultural commodities from increasing their ceiling prices, based on higher costs of below parity farm products, until amounts equal to the inventory on hand of the lower cost processed commodities have been sold. These changes were accomplished by the issuance of Amendment 17 to the General Ceiling Price Regulation and Amendment 16 to Ceiling Price Regulation 22, both effective July 17.

Amendment to the General Ceiling Price Regulation

The ban on "inventory windfalls" for products priced under the General Ceiling Price Regulation was accomplished by Amendment 13 to the Regulation effective on May 28. This amendment provided that, when a canner refigured his ceiling price under Section 11 of the Regulation to take into account increased costs of an agricultural commodity selling below the legal minima provided in the Defense

(Please turn to page 264)

House Debates Amendments To Defense Act of 1950

During the week the House gave the Defense Production Act amendments full and complete debate. House passage of a bill probably will occur next week. Tuesday of this week was spent, for the most part, defeating the Administration on two counts: (1) An amendment by Andresen of Minnesota (identical with language adopted by the Senate) that would limit imports of fats and oils, and (2) an amendment by Hope of Kansas (also identical with Senate language) that removes quotas on the slaughtering of livestock. Both amendments were carried by substantial majorities.

On Wednesday the House discussed and defeated a Banking Committee proposal to set up standards for the diversion of defense plants.

The House spent Thursday on the subjects of extending the President's authority to acquire real property and to institute subsidies on agricultural commodities. Both of these Administration requests were defeated. Congressman Wolcott (Mich.) offered a substitute for the Administration proposal limiting the authority of the President to acquire real property and Congressman Cooley (N. C.) was sustained in his move to take away the proposed subsidy authority over agricultural commodities.

Chairman Cooley of the House Committee on Agriculture, who sponsored the present 31-day ban on rollbacks, has announced that he will offer the following amendment which deals *only with agricultural* commodities:

( ) Section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended

(Please turn to page 266)

Annual Fruit and Vegetable Pack Bulletins Mailed

The Association's annual *Canned Food Pack Statistics: Part I—Vegetables* and *Part II—Fruits* were mailed to the industry this week. The bulletins show the packs of major vegetables and fruits, giving the industry's total U. S. production for each commodity by can size and principal states where packed. The information is compiled from data furnished by individual canner's report to the Association for statistical purposes. The 1950 production figures are presented in comparison with packs of previous years.

The publications provide a historical reference work for the industry and in addition are used as a source of information by allied industries and Government departments.

Additional copies may be obtained upon request to the Association's Division of Statistics.

DEFENSE

Text of OPS Interpretation of GOR 13

Following is the text of the OPS interpretation of General Overriding Regulation 13, referred to in the *Information Letter* of July 7:

Section 2 of GOR 13 provides that a seller's ceiling price for any commodity under a listed regulation is determined under that regulation if it "was in effect" as to him on June 30, 1951.

This interpretation is intended to clarify the meaning of the phrase "was in effect," and to provide a basis for determining whether a manufacturer had actually put a regulation into effect as to him prior to July 1. It is believed that this interpretation disposes of most of the questions presented to the OPS on this subject, and that application of the tests here stated will provide clear answers. But it is not possible, of course, to anticipate all fact situations; these may require further rulings, not modifying the rules here stated but developing other rules which must be taken into account.

Under GOR 13, a seller to be under CPR 22 or 30 must have exercised his option to put the regulation into effect on or before June 30. If he can show this, then the regulation is in effect as to him for all his products covered by that regulation.

How can a seller show that he put CPR 22 or 30 into effect as to him on or before June 30? He must do this by showing that on or before June 30, he had both complied with the requirements of the regulation and had taken action to put it into effect prior to July 1, either by making price increases effective prior to July 1, or by other action, such as actual written notification to OPS or his customers that he was putting the regulation in effect prior to July 1, 1951.

A necessary prerequisite to put CPR 22 and CPR 30 into effect in the case of a price increase was that a Form 8 be filed more than 15 days prior to putting the increase into effect. Each of these regulations also provides in effect that any seller who made it effective for an increase also made it effective for all decreases.

This means that no one can be said to have put CPR 22 or CPR 30 into effect on or before June 30 who did not receive a return receipt or other acknowledgment showing that his Form 8 proposing a price increase had been received prior to June 15, 1951.

A mere filing of the form, however, does not indicate that CPR 22 or CPR 30 was in effect as to a seller. Many sellers filed their Form 8's before June 15th but did not exercise their option to put into effect either the price increases or price decreases, or both, which would have resulted from the use of the regulations in question. The regulations were not in effect as to these sellers. If, however, prior to July 1, 1951 the sellers, acting pursuant to CPR 22 or CPR 30, made offers in writing, contracts, sales, or deliveries at prices above their GCPR prices, that shows such sellers put the regulations into effect.

When the seller's only action in putting the regulation into effect was in terms applicable solely to deliveries after June 30, 1951, this shows that the seller was putting the regulation into effect after that date and was merely making advance arrangements for deliveries to be governed by ceilings in effect at the time of delivery. In that case, GCPR continues in effect. For example, a manufacturer whose increase was announced only in a price list marked effective July 1, 1951 is still under the GCPR. Where no offers or sales at the CPR 22 or CPR 30 prices were made and no other action was taken to indicate that CPR 22 or CPR 30 was put into effect, the General Ceiling Price Regulation remained in effect as to the seller on June 30, 1951.

A seller may be able to show that he put CPR 22 into effect on or before June 30 by showing that before June 15 he filed Form 8's proposing increases over GCPR ceilings for commodities A and B and actually put the increases into effect on or before June 30 for A. In this situation CPR 22 was generally in effect for the seller on June 30, even as to commodities other than A. If OPS had stopped the proposed increase for commodity B, he would be required to wait for OPS action as to that commodity; OPS will process his form and he can charge the ceiling price for B approved by OPS. Similarly, the mere fact that this seller did not file an additional form as to Commodity C on or before June 14 does not preclude him from filing subsequently for that commodity, and he must file Form 8 before he sells commodity C, and comply with the 15-day waiting period if he proposes a price increase for that commodity.

However, if he filed only one Form 8 before June 15 and that was not in effect on June 30 because of OPS action, then CPR 22 was not in effect as to him on June 30.

A seller who has CPR 22 or CPR 30 in effect under GOR 13 has it in effect as to all provisions, including rollbacks, adjustments, supplementary regulations, filings, etc.

What has been said about CPR 22 and CPR 30 applies generally to the other manufacturers' regulations listed in GOR 13. Some of them require no filing and no 15-day waiting period. To show that these regulations were put into effect the seller need not show a filing, but he must show that he either sold at the new higher prices or otherwise took some action which clearly indicated an election to price under the new regulations prior to July 1. Under CPR's 18, 18 Revision 1, 37, and 41, the election could have been made as to individual articles. Under CPR 45 the election applies to all articles in the category, that is, if the seller clearly indicated an election to price any article under CPR 45, his election applies to all articles in the same category, whether the resulting ceiling prices are higher or lower than the GCPR ceiling prices for the articles.

Stambaugh To Assist on USDA Defense Programs

Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan announced July 12 the appointment of John H. Stambaugh as an assistant to the Secretary for special work in connection with agricultural defense requirements.

Mr. Stambaugh, a farmer and businessman and former Department official, will assist in the preparation and presentation of requirements for materials and facilities which are vital in the production and handling of food and other agricultural commodities. He will work with the Production and Marketing Administration and other units of the Department of Agriculture which establish agricultural needs and with the mobilization agencies which determine allocations and priorities for materials and facilities.

Windfall Ban Removed

(Concluded from page 263)

Production Act, such increase could not be put into effect until such time as an amount of the processed commodity had been sold equal to the amount previously packed and on hand on the date he would otherwise have been entitled to raise his price. This amendment was discussed in detail in a supplement to the INFORMATION LETTER of June 2, 1951.

Amendment 17 to the General Ceiling Price Regulation eliminates the prohibition added by Amendment 13. The full text of Amendment 17 accompanies this issue of the LETTER and contains the revised wording of Section 11 (b) (2) of the Regulation. Canners may now, therefore, apply any adjustments in price ceilings permitted under Section 11 of the General Ceiling Price Regulation, based on increased costs of raw agricultural commodities selling below the legal minima

provided in the Defense Production Act, not only to the foods processed from the agricultural commodities purchased at the higher cost but also to inventories of processed foods then on hand and previously packed from agricultural commodities purchased at a lower cost.

Amendment to Ceiling Price Regulation 22

Ceiling Price Regulation 22 as originally issued contained in Section 21 provisions similar to those incorporated in the General Ceiling Price Regulation by Amendment 13. Processors of commodities covered by the Regulation were prohibited from applying increased ceiling prices, based on increases in cost of agricultural commodities, to existing inventories. Section 21 of the Regulation sets forth the circumstances under which increases in ceiling prices can be made effective based on increased costs of materials listed in Appendix C to the Regulation (the agricultural products selling below the legal minima prescribed in the Defense Production Act). Paragraph (d) of Section 21 contained the prohibition against "inventory windfalls."

The deletion of the "inventory windfall" prohibition of Ceiling Price Regulation 22 was accomplished by Amendment 16 to the Regulation. The full text of this amendment accompanies this issue of the INFORMATION LETTER. Section 21 (d) (1) has been redrafted to eliminate the proviso that a canner could not put a recalculated ceiling price into effect, based on increased costs of agricultural commodities listed in Appendix C of the Regulation, until he had first sold an amount of the processed commodity being priced equal to the quantity owned at the close of business on the date he would otherwise have been entitled to put the increased ceiling into effect. Canners of products covered by Ceiling Price Regulation 22 may now apply any increased price ceilings permitted under Section 21 of the Regulation, based on increased costs of agricultural commodities, not only to the products processed from agricultural commodities purchased at the higher cost but also to inventories on hand and previously packed from agricultural commodities purchased at a lower cost.

An additional change has been made in Section 21 of the Regulation dealing with the agricultural products to which the section applies. As originally issued, Section 21 (d) (2) provided that a canner might not use a current date in figuring the changes in net cost of agricultural commodities if it was subsequent to the date of the deletion of the commodity from Appendix C by the Director of Price Stabilization or a date more than five days subsequent to the date upon which the Secretary of Agriculture announced by publication in "Agricultural Prices" a price for the commodity which equaled or exceeded both the parity price and the highest price received by producers during the period May 24 to June 24, 1950. The automatic provisions tying this cut-off date to the date of publication in "Agricultural Prices" have been eliminated and the Regulation, as now amended, prohibits a canner from using a current date in figuring the change in net cost of an agricultural commodity only after the Director of Price Stabilization has deleted such commodity from Appendix C.

An additional paragraph (g) has been added to Section 21 specifying the reports to be filed with the Office of Price Stabilization when increases in ceiling prices, above prices initially calculated under the Regulation, are put into effect. This is a simplified notification procedure similar to that provided in Section 11 of the General Ceiling Price Regulation. The full text of paragraph (g) is contained in Section 3 of Amendment 16 and canners may refer to this for details of the reports required by registered letter.

Section 48 of the Regulation has been amended to provide for the reports required under Section 21 (g). Section 48 previously required anyone increasing a ceiling price on a product subject to the Regulation to wait fifteen days after the date of receipt of the required reports on Form No. 8 by the Director of Price Stabilization. As changed by Amendment 16, Section 48 does not require the reports on Form No. 8 and the fifteen day waiting period in the case of ceiling prices raised, pursuant to Section 21, above prices initially calculated under the Regulation.

Paragraph (f) of Section 21 of the Regulation, which was added by Amendment 2 to provide special methods for cooperatives and producer-processors in calculating increased ceilings under the section, has been slightly changed to conform to the changes in cut-off date in paragraph (d) of Section 21 and to require the reports specified in the new paragraph (g). No changes have been made in the general method of calculating increases in ceiling prices under paragraph (f) for such processors.

Maintenance, Repair Order

CMP Regulation 5, "Maintenance, Repair, and Operating Supplies and Minor Capital Additions under the Controlled Materials Plan", has been issued. It revokes and replaces NPA Regulation 4. A copy of CMP Reg. 5 is being mailed with this issue of the LETTER.

CMP Reg. 5 provides for the same self-certification for MRO, and includes many of the same provisions of Regulation 4. The symbols MRO and DO-MRO replace DO-97. MRO orders for the controlled materials, steel, copper and aluminum must bear the symbol "MRO". Orders for maintenance, repair and operating materials other than the controlled materials must bear the symbol "DO-MRO". Outstanding orders bearing the DO-97 must be converted to either "MRO" or "DO-MRO" by August 15.

Provisions are made for seasonal quotas and the same 120 per cent dollar expenditures for MRO in the base year 1950 has been retained.

The NPA pointed out that outstanding orders for maintenance, repair and operating supplies calling for delivery during the current calendar quarter, bearing the rating DO-97 and placed before July 6, will have equal preferential status with authorized controlled materials orders, or DO-rated orders identified by an allotment number or symbol.

Crop Loss Allowances

(Concluded from page 263)

fornia and $109 per ton in Washington.

The maximum raw material costs for freestone peaches for canning or freezing, which, if paid, may be reflected in ceiling prices, will be $102 in Washington and Oregon and $94 per ton in Michigan.

These adjustments, OPS said, will be made in accordance with the provisions of Section 402 (d) (3) of the Defense Production Act which requires that appropriate allowances shall be made in ceiling prices for processed agricultural commodities to reflect substantial reductions in merchantable crop yields, unusual increases in cost of production, and other factors which result from agricultural hazards.

The normal legal minimum prices will be adjusted by the percentage of 1951 processing crop loss from the 10 year (1940-49) average crop as reported by the U. S. Department of Agriculture for each of the producing states.

Defense Act of 1950

(Concluded from page 263)

by adding at the end thereof a new subsection:

( ) No existing ceiling shall be maintained and no new ceiling shall be placed into effect for any agricultural commodity (including dairy products) at a level below the average price for each grade, quality or type of any such commodity prevailing therefor in the 10 days immediately preceding the issuance of the regulation or order first establishing a ceiling for such commodity.

Cooley's Committee spent the previous weekend seeking to agree on a series of anti-rollback amendments that would cover all commodities. No general agreement was reached, but a tacit acceptance of the above is understood to exist within the Committee. In addition, Congressman Poage of Texas will submit an amendment establishing certain criteria that must be met by OPS in setting ceiling prices on processed agricultural commodities. The Poage amendment has been under constant discussion and revision since July 2 and also seems to have tacit Committee backing. It began as an adaptation of a cotton-wool limitation in the old price law. The latest draft of the proposal follows:

Section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

It shall be unlawful to establish or maintain any ceiling price applicable to manufacturers or processors, for any item of material derived in whole or in substantial part from an agricultural commodity if such ceiling price for any such item of material is fixed and maintained at less than the sum of the following:

(1) The current cost of the material used therein computed on a delivered basis, (except that the cost of the agricultural commodity used therein shall be computed on the basis of the current cost or the price specified in section 402 (d) (3), of the commodity delivered to the manufacturer or processor, whichever is greater);

(2) All costs currently incurred in the processing or manufacturing operation and distribution of such item, including an allowance for such indirect costs as may reasonably be attributable to such item of material;

(3) A reasonable profit (which for each unit of such item shall be not less than 85 percentum of the average profit earned on an equivalent unit of such item during the three most profitable years of the period 1946 to 1949, both inclusive); *Provided*, That if specific dollars and cents ceilings applicable to manufacturers or processors are established for any such item of material and made generally applicable, the costs and profits referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection, for each item of such material shall be computed by using a weighted average of such costs and profits of the individual processors or manufacturers of such item.

Regardless of the anti-rollback language passed by the House, the subject will go to Conference since it is highly improbable that the House will pass the exact language on anti-rollbacks adopted by the Senate. The joint House-Senate Conference Committee will have wide latitude in considering the amendments affecting the canning industry that must be worked out at the Conference Committee level.

The Poage amendment is not an anti-rollback proposal, although its effect would require OPS to review CPR 42 and remove the cost absorptions in that regulation.

STANDARDS

Canned Beans Standards

The U. S. Department of Agriculture announced on July 11 revised U.S. standards for grades of canned green beans and canned waxed beans. Changes have been made in the quality factors of character and absence of defects. The factors of color and clearness of liquor are the same as in the previous standards.

The revised standards are the result of studies which have been made by the Department and recommendations received from industry for the improvement of the standards. These standards will become effective on July 16.

Frozen Spinach Standards

The U. S. Department of Agriculture on July 9 announced a proposed revision of United States standards for grades of frozen spinach.

The grades of frozen spinach would be designated as U. S. Grade A or U. S. Fancy, U. S. Grade B or U. S. Extra Standard, and Substandard. The quality factors, color, absence of defects, and character, which are evaluated in determining the grade of the product, remain the same as in the previous standards.

Provision is made in the revised standards for cut or chopped style of frozen spinach, in addition to the whole leaf style. These standards will be the fifth issue of U. S. standards for grades of this product.

Interested parties may submit views and comments during the next 30 days to the Fruit and Vegetable Branch, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C.

PROCUREMENT

USDA To Buy Peas, Cherries

The Department of Agriculture has announced that it will buy on a competitive bid basis about 170,000 cases of canned green peas and 450,000 cases of canned red sour pitted cherries (No. 2's or equivalent) from the 1951 crop for the National School Lunch Program.

Under Sub-Orders 1 and 2 of Defense Food Order 2, green pea canners currently are required to set aside 15 percent and sour cherry canners 25 percent of their 1951 packs for use by the Armed Forces and other Government agencies. These set-aside percentages included minimum purchases for the National School Lunch Program. School Lunch purchases will be removed from the set-aside orders and the entire quantity to be bought will be acquired on a competitive bid basis. This action is expected to reduce the set-aside percentages for green peas and sour cherries and as soon as proper determinations can be made, Sub-Orders 1 and 2 of DFO 2 will be revised to the new set-aside percentages.

Invitations to offer canned green peas and sour cherries for school lunch use, including detailed specifications, are now being mailed to all known green pea and sour cherry canners. Offers of green peas should be submitted to the Department by July 26, for acceptance not later than July 31, and of cherries by July 23, for acceptance not later than July 27.

LABOR

Labor Bill Now Law

The Mexican farm labor bill, S. 984, was signed by the President July 12. State, Labor and Immigration and Naturalization Service sent representatives to Mexico City to negotiate for establishment of Mexican recruitment centers. Dependent somewhat on these will be the location of reception centers on the U. S. side of the border. From these centers Mexican nationals will be moved to U. S. agricultural employment.

RAW PRODUCTS

Is One Spray Effective to Destroy Corn Insects?

Effective measures for control of corn insects, including corn borer, earworm, and fall armyworm are described in articles recently published in the *Food Packer*, written by Dr. L. P. Ditman of the Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station. These articles are based upon extensive studies conducted at that station during the past three years and upon pilot experiments carried out in cooperation with two corn canners. Data were obtained at the corn cannery on husker capacity per hour, percent cutoff, cases packed per hour and per ton from both treated and untreated sweet corn. The Maryland station also cooperated with the Division of Farm Machinery of the U. S. Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering in designing a self-propelled, high-clearance sprayer suitable for applying spray materials.

Separates of the articles which appeared in the *Food Packer*, together with specifications for construction of the high-clearance self-propelled corn sprayer are obtainable by writing directly to Dr. L. P. Ditman, Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station, College Park, Md.

TRAFFIC

Text of ICC General Permits

Relief to canners on their shipments of import freight, barrels and drums, mixed commodities, and mixed cars of foods in tin and glass, was provided in special permits under heavy carloading Order 878 as reported in the INFORMATION LETTER of July 7, page 257. The Association now has copies of the official texts of these orders.

Text of General Permit No. 1-F (carload freight):

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION
BUREAU OF SERVICE

GENERAL PERMIT NO. 1-F
UNDER SERVICE ORDER NO. 878

Pursuant to the authority vested in me in Paragraph (e) of Service Order No. 878 (16 F.R. 5768), permission is granted for any common carrier by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act to disregard the provisions of Service Order No. 878 insofar as they apply to carload freight (including import, coastwise, and intercoastal freight) moving first by water on the high seas to a port in the continental United States and thence by rail in a single car, or moving first by water on the high seas to a port in the continental United States, thence by an inland water carrier to another point in the continental United States, and thence by rail in a single car to destination when, in either case, such carload freight moves as a complete order from both the point it is first shipped by water and the point it is reshipped by rail.

The shipping instructions and waybills shall show reference to this General Permit, and any consignor forwarding cars under this General Permit shall furnish the Permit Agent with the dates forwarded, car numbers, initials, weights and destinations of the cars shipped under this General Permit; such information to be furnished on the first day of each month.

This General Permit shall become effective at 12:01 a.m., July 16, 1951, and shall expire at 11:59 p.m., November 30, 1951, unless otherwise modified, changed, suspended or revoked.

A copy of this General Permit has been served upon the Association of American Railroads, Car Service Division, as agent of the railroads subscribing to the car service and per diem agreement under the terms of that agreement, and notice of this permit shall be given to the general public by depositing a copy in the office of the Secretary of the Commission at Washington, D. C., and by filing it with the Director, Division of the Federal Register.

Issued at Washington, D. C., this 6th day of July, 1951.

HOWARD S. KLINE,
Permit Agent.

Text of General Permit No. 2-F (barrels and drums):

Pursuant to the authority vested in me in Paragraph (e) of Service Order No. 878 (16 F.R. 5768), permission is granted for any common carrier by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act to disregard the provisions of Service Order No. 878 insofar as they apply to any car loaded with any commodity named in Appendix A in barrels or drums weighing 500 pounds or more when such barrels or drums are loaded on end one tier high covering the entire floor space of the car, and/or in barrels or drums weighing 250 pounds or more each and less than 500 pounds loaded on end two tiers high covering the entire floor space of the car.

* * *

(Editor's Note: The instructions in paragraph 2, 3 and 4 of General Permit No. 1-F are repeated and apply to No. 2-F.)

Text of General Permit No. 3-F (mixed commodities):

Pursuant to the authority vested in me in Paragraph (e) of Service Order No. 878 (16 F.R. 5768), permission is granted for any common carrier by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act to disregard the provisions of Service Order No. 878 insofar as they apply to any car loaded with mixed commodities including commodities named in Appendix A when the volume of commodities named in Appendix A is thirty-three and one-third percent or less by weight of the total weight of the car.

* * *

(Editor's Note: The instructions in paragraph 2, 3 and 4 of General Permit No. 1-F are repeated and apply to No. 3-F.)

Text of General Permit No. 4-F (foods in tin and glass):

Pursuant to the authority vested in me in Paragraph (e) of Service Order No. 878 (16 F.R. 5768), permission is granted for any common carrier by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act to disregard the provisions of Service Order No. 878 insofar as they apply to carload freight consisting of commodities named in Appendix A packed in glass in cartons and packed in tin in cartons in mixed cars when such cars are loaded to 60,000 pounds or more.

* * *

(Editor's Note: The instructions in paragraph 2, 3 and 4 of General Permit No. 1-F are repeated and apply to No. 4-F.)

DEATH

Frank W. Douthitt

Frank W. Douthitt, 76, founder of the Big Stone Canning Co., Ortonville, Minn., died June 29, following a long illness.

Born in Indianapolis in 1875, Mr. Douthitt started in the canning business packing Indiana tomatoes. He was associated with the Northland Canning Co. at Cokato, Minn., for several years before organizing Big Stone. Later he acquired a canning plant at Arlington, Minn.

He was considered the oldest canner in that state and was identified with many of the early developments in corn canning methods and equipment.

Mr. Douthitt was one of the first members of the National Canners Association and was active in the early activities of the Association. Also he was a charter member of the Minnesota Canners Association which he had served both as secretary and president.

STATISTICS

1951 Acreage of Peas for Canning

The actual planted acreage of green peas sown for canning in 1951 totaled 343,924 acres or a little over 8.5 percent above the planted acreage in 1950 of 316,976 acres, according to the Association's Division of Statistics.

(Another report on pea acreage, prepared by the Department of Agriculture, showing both indicated acreage and tonnage of peas grown for canning and freezing, appears in this issue of the INFORMATION LETTER on this page.)

The following table is based on reports from all canners known to have planted peas for canning in 1951, together with estimates for two firms not reporting. The total acreage for 1950 is also given for comparison.

These acreage figures cover only peas planted for canning and do not include acreage for freezing, brining, or other purposes. However, in harvesting some acreage may be diverted into other forms of processing rather than canning.

1951 Pea Acreage with Comparisons

States	Alaskas	Sweets—Early	Sweets—Late	1951 Total	1950 Total
	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)
Maine	.....	915	926	1,841	1,875
New York	400	6,661	7,083	14,147	14,831
Maryland	4,861	2,476	1,688	9,025	8,196
Delaware and New Jersey	370	20	30	420	300
Pennsylvania	3,013	2,816	4,429	10,258	9,543
Ohio	1,987	490	40	2,517	2,243
Indiana	2,953	.....	71	3,024	3,218
Illinois	5,370	6,628	15,701	27,708	24,429
Michigan	1,006	2,268	732	4,006	3,824
Wisconsin	48,550	40,745	44,831	134,126	123,122
Minnesota	15,118	4,301	21,008	40,427	36,267
Utah and Idaho	.....	3,358	10,722	14,080	10,438
Washington and Oregon	5,931	17,742	41,660	65,333	60,435
Other states	3,066	4,855	8,471	17,012	12,255
U. S. Total	93,257	93,275	157,302	343,934	316,976

1951 Canning Acreages Larger

The 1951 acreage of crops for commercial processing promises to be substantially larger than in 1950. The planted acreages of snap beans, green peas, winter and spring spinach, green lima beans, and cucumbers for pickles are above both last year and average. The acreage of green lima beans is the largest of record. The planted acreages of sweet corn and tomatoes are substantially larger this year than last but are still below average.

Weather during the last half of June was favorable for green peas and for the country as a whole, the yield per acre of processing peas promises to be the largest since 1920.

Pimientos for Processing

Pimiento processors in Georgia have planted or contracted 18,000 acres of pimientos for 1951, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. While this is 44 percent less than the record 1950 plantings of 32,000 acres, it is still 37 percent greater than the 1940-49 average plantings of 13,130 acres.

Dry weather at setting time and diversion of acreage to cotton were the main reasons for the decrease in acreage. Poor stands and relatively unfavorable growth were reported on July 1 from many areas in the State. However, rains, which had recently been received in most sections, were expected to partially overcome the late start.

Lima Beans for Processing

The prospects are for a record-high acreage of green lima beans for commercial canning and freezing in 1951, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The acreage is 14 percent more than the acreage planted last year. This year's acreage is larger than last year's plantings in all important producing States except Ohio, Maryland and Virginia.

The condition of the crop on July 1 is reported at 88 percent which compares with 91 percent for the same date last year.

State	Planted Acreage—1950 Preliminary	Planted Acreage—1950 Revised	Planted Acreage—1951 Preliminary
	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)
New York	2,000	3,600	5,000
Pennsylvania	3,200	3,500	4,200
Ohio	700	800	700
Michigan	3,000	2,780	3,500
Wisconsin	5,500	6,000	7,800
Delaware	17,700	21,000	24,000
Maryland	5,200	5,900	4,700
Virginia	4,300	4,300	4,000
Washington	2,400	2,000	2,200
California	22,100	20,100	24,000
Other states [1]	28,720	30,200	34,540
U. S. Total	94,820	100,180	114,640

[1] Ark., Colo., Ga., Idaho, Ill., Ind., Iowa, Kans., Minn., Mo., N. J., Okla., Ore., Tenn. and Utah.

Green Peas for Processing

The July 1 indicated production of green peas for canning and freezing in 1951 is 506,490 tons, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. During the last half of June, conditions improved slightly for the country as a whole and the production now in prospect is about 17 percent more than the 1950 production of 433,830 tons.

The July 1 indicated yield per acre is 2,206 pounds of shelled peas. This compares with 2,075 pounds obtained in 1950.

State	Acreage—Harvested 1950	Acreage—For harvest 1951	Production—1950	Production—Indicated 1951
	(acres)		(tons—shelled)	
Maine	8,950	9,350	8,460	8,600
New York	31,100	31,700	23,640	31,700
New Jersey	3,460	3,200	3,510	4,560
Pennsylvania	13,300	14,100	15,430	1,760
Ohio	2,500	3,300	2,000	2,970
Indiana	3,200	4,600	2,260	4,140
Illinois	23,800	27,700	27,490	36,010
Michigan	5,600	5,800	4,960	4,930
Wisconsin	118,100	129,000	128,730	141,900
Minnesota	52,200	59,000	42,280	67,850
Iowa	4,300	4,500	4,670	4,500
Delaware	1,920	2,400	1,600	2,520
Maryland	6,670	7,400	8,070	9,500
Virginia	1,850	2,100	1,680	1,970
Idaho	6,900	9,600	9,600	13,920
Colorado	3,800	3,900	3,700	4,100
Utah	11,900	9,400	16,730	14,100
Washington	55,000	62,200	61,600	77,750
Oregon	32,100	36,000	34,700	36,000
California	7,870	10,090	9,400	14,230
Other states [1]	3,540	3,660	3,220	3,130
U. S. Total	418,060	459,000	433,830	506,490

[1] Ark., Ga., Kans., Mo., Mont., Nebr., Okla., Tenn., Texas, W. Va., and Wyo.

Beets for Canning

The 1951 planted acreage of beets for canning is expected to be about 2 percent less than in 1950, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The condition of the crop on July 1 is reported at 93 percent which compares with 90 percent for July 1, 1950.

State	Planted Acreage 1950 Preliminary	1950 Revised	1951 Preliminary
	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)
New York	4,600	3,900	3,600
New Jersey	800	770	820
Michigan	1,300	1,500	1,300
Wisconsin	8,200	8,200	8,600
Oregon	2,000	2,150	2,150
Other states [1]	3,090	3,280	3,020
U. S. Total	19,990	19,800	19,490

[1] Calif., Colo., Ill., Ind., Iowa, La., Me., Md., Minn., Miss., Ohio, Pa., Tenn., Texas, Utah and Wash.

Canned Meat Report

The quantity of meat canned, and meat products processed under federal inspection during the five-week period April 29-June 2 is reported by the Bureau of Animal Industry as follows:

Canned Meat and Meat Products Processed Under Federal Inspection April 29-June 2, 1951 [*]

	3 lbs. & over	Under 3 lbs.	Total
	(in thousand pounds)		
Luncheon meat	20,677	11,907	32,584
Canned hams	17,485	2,663	20,148
Corned beef hash	838	5,925	6,763
Chile con carne	1,748	3,873	5,621
Vienna sausage	99	5,838	5,937
Frankfurters and weiners in brine	5	4,727	4,732
Deviled ham	.....	896	896
Other potted and deviled meat products	.....	3,426	3,426
Tamales	43	1,514	1,557
Sliced, dried beef	28	454	482
Liver products	.....	202	202
Meat stew	10	6,555	6,565
Spaghetti meat products	98	8,551	8,649
Tongue (except pickled)	26	288	314
Vinegar pickled products	1,006	1,831	2,837
Bulk sausage	30	4,778	4,808
Hamburger	1,769	6,459	8,228
Soups	1,314	38,301	40,615
Sausage in oil	145	144	289
Tripe	.....	708	708
Brains	.....	286	286
Bacon	117	2,603	2,720
All other products 20% or more meat	220	12,073	12,293
All other products less than 20% meat (except soup)	184	14,052	14,136
Total all products	45,791	139,054	184,845

[*] Columns do not add to total shown in all cases since rounded figures are used.

Tomatoes for Processing

The 1951 planted acreage of tomatoes for processing is 477,970 acres, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. This is about 28 percent more than the revised estimate of 372,820 acres planted in 1950. The 1951 estimate of 477,970 acres planted is 2.5 percent less than the 490,200 acres indicated by the intentions-to-plant report last spring. The condition of the crop on July 1, 1951 of 90.7 percent compares with 89.5 percent for July 1, 1950.

State	Planted Acreage 1950 Preliminary	1950 Revised	1951 Preliminary
	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)
New York	20,800	20,800	20,400
New Jersey	25,800	29,800	30,000
Pennsylvania	21,000	21,000	24,000
Ohio	23,200	23,200	19,300
Indiana	67,700	67,700	77,900
Illinois	10,900	10,900	12,900
Michigan	8,800	8,800	8,700
Wisconsin	1,900	1,900	1,700
Iowa	1,300	1,300	2,000
Missouri	6,700	7,000	6,800
Delaware	12,000	5,300	6,100
Maryland	32,000	30,800	35,400
Virginia	15,800	15,000	18,600
South Carolina	3,600	3,600	4,500
Florida	3,000	3,500	5,000
Kentucky	2,300	2,300	1,800
Tennessee	2,400	2,400	2,400
Arkansas	8,100	8,500	11,000
Oklahoma	1,300	1,300	1,300
Texas	17,500	17,500	18,500
Colorado	3,700	3,700	4,000
Utah	7,600	7,600	8,400
California	78,000	75,520	148,000
Other states [1]	3,750	3,400	3,270
U. S. Total	379,150	372,820	477,970

[1] Ala., Ariz., Conn., Ga., Idaho, Kans., La., Minn., Miss., Nebr., N. Mex., N. C., Ore., Wash. and W. Va.

Cabbage for Kraut

The 1951 contract acreage of cabbage planted for sauerkraut is 3 percent less than last year, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports. The preliminary 1951 estimate is 10,140 acres compared with 10,490 acres for 1950. This contract acreage represents only part of the acreage used for kraut. The open-market acreage represented 45 percent of the total kraut acreage in 1950.

The total acreage of cabbage being grown in the summer and early fall (domestic) groups of States is estimated at 60,350 acres compared with 64,060 acres in 1950. This covers acreage under contract with kraut packers, acreage available for open-market purchases by kraut packers, and acreage for the fresh market.

State	Planted Acreage —1950 Revised— Total [1]	Contract [2]	1951 Contract [2]
	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)
New York	5,700	1,900	2,000
Ohio	1,800	1,700	1,500
Indiana	2,300	1,700	1,400
Illinois	200	.....	.....
Michigan	330	330	230
Wisconsin	4,800	2,600	2,800
Minnesota	160	100	90
Colorado	250	200	170
Washington	270	230	240
Other states [3]	3,110	1,730	1,710
U. S. Total	18,920	10,490	10,140

[1] Total acreage is the contract acreage (footnote 2) plus an equivalent acreage from which open-market purchases were made.

[2] Contract acreage includes acreage grown by packers on own or leased land as well as acreage grown under contract with growers.

[3] Fla., Iowa, Md., Mo., N. J., N. C., Ore., Pa., Tenn., Texas, Utah and Va.

Snap Beans for Processing

The 1951 indicated production of snap beans for processing, as of July 1, is 272,200 tons, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports. The 1951 preliminary estimate of acreage for harvest is 125,930 acres. This compares with 116,970 acres harvested in 1950. Allowance was made for abandoned or unharvested acreage about in line with the average loss for recent years.

State	Acreage Harvested 1950	For harvest 1951	Production 1950 Revised	Indicated 1951
	(acres)		(tons)	
Maine	2,500	2,950	5,500	7,100
New York	24,400	27,000	41,500	48,600
New Jersey	2,000	2,500	5,000	5,000
Pennsylvania	4,500	5,500	9,900	15,400
Michigan	6,400	6,800	9,600	8,800
Wisconsin	12,000	12,200	18,000	18,300
Missouri	800	700	1,200	1,000
Delaware	1,200	1,900	2,600	2,800
Maryland	10,300	11,200	16,500	15,700
Virginia	3,000	2,800	4,500	4,200
N. Carolina	2,000	1,700	3,000	2,600
S. Carolina	500	400	600	400
Georgia	500	200	500	200
Florida [1]	7,500	11,000	11,000	16,500
Tennessee	5,500	5,800	10,400	9,300
Mississippi	2,000	2,200	2,600	2,200
Arkansas	7,500	7,000	9,000	8,400
Louisiana	900	400	700	400
Oklahoma	3,000	2,700	3,600	3,800
Texas	5,500	5,000	7,200	7,000
Colorado	1,300	1,400	5,100	4,500
Utah	750	700	3,200	2,800
Washington	2,400	2,600	12,200	12,500
Oregon	6,600	6,900	53,500	55,200
California	2,100	2,100	12,800	14,700
Other states [2]	1,840	2,280	4,200	4,800
U. S. Total	116,970	125,930	254,500	272,200

[1] Sum of estimates by seasonal groups. [2] Ala., Idaho, Ill., Ind., Iowa, Ky., Mass., Minn., Mont., Nebr., N. Mex., Ohio, Vt. and Wyo.

Estimated Production Of 1951 Fruit Crops

In the 1951-52 canning season, which is just getting under way, it seems probable that somewhat more fruit will be canned than in 1950-51, according to the June 1951 report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics entitled *The Fruit Situation*. The prospective 1951 crop of deciduous fruits is larger than the 1950 crop, packers' stocks of several important canned fruits are smaller than at the start of the 1950-51 season, and civilian demand for canned fruits continues strong. An added factor is increased Government set-aside and other requirements for canned fruits for defense purposes, the Report states.

Despite the set-asides, which are considerably larger than Government procurement from the 1950 packs, total civilian supplies of canned fruits in 1951-52, because of increased packs, are expected to be about as large as in 1950-51.

Highlights of the BAE Fruit report touching specific commodities, are given below:

Peaches—Production of peaches in the United States was estimated on June 1 at 65.5 million bushels, about 23 percent larger than the small 1950 crop but 8 percent below the 1940-49 average.

The California crop of clingstone peaches, which are used mostly for canning, is estimated at 21.9 million bushels, about 11 percent larger than the 1950 crop and 15 percent larger than average. This State's freestone crop, of which a considerable portion also usually is canned as well as dried and used fresh, is estimated at 10.5 million bushels, slightly over 1950. Another small crop is in prospect in Washington this year.

With the larger California crop of clingstone peaches, which will be ready for harvest in mid-summer, and an expected strong demand for peaches for canning, it seems probable that there will be a considerable increase in the 1951 pack of canned clingstone peaches. There also may be some increase in the 1951 pack of canned freestones. Packers' stocks of canned peaches on June 1, 1951, were 75 percent smaller than comparable stocks in 1950.

Apricots—Production of apricots in California, Washington, and Utah in 1951 is forecast at 170,600 tons. The decrease is in California. Washington and Utah crop is slightly larger than 1950. Canners' stocks on June 1, 1951, were about 75 percent smaller than on that date in 1950.

Sweet Cherries—Production of sweet cherries in 1951 is estimated at 68,460 tons, 16 percent under 1950. In the western States, production is considerably smaller than the below-average crop of 1950. Most of the decrease is in the heavy-producing States of California, Oregon and Washington.

Red Pitted Cherries—The 1951 crop of sour cherries is estimated at 153,950 tons. This is only 4 percent smaller than the record 1950 crop. Production in Michigan again is large, the crop of 88,000 tons being 10 percent smaller than the record 1950 crop. The New York crop of 29,000 tons is record large. Production in the five eastern States of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Ohio is 142,330 tons, 92 percent of the total sour cherry crop.

Pears—The 1951 crop of pears is estimated as of June 1 at 31.3 million bushels, about the same as the 1950 crop. The Bartlett crop of 18.3 million bushels is slightly smaller than the 1950 crop. Most of the pears canned commercially in the United States consist of Pacific Coast Bartletts. Another large canned pack seems likely. The 1950-51 pack was second only to the record 1941-42 pack.

Military procurement from the new pack of canned pears is expected to be considerably larger than that from the 1950 pack.

Apples—Production of apples in commercial areas in 1951 will be somewhat smaller than the 1950 crop. Prospects are for a considerable reduction in the 1951 crop in the Pacific Northwest, because of cold weather this spring.

Unusually large stocks of apples have been held in cold storage the first half of 1951. More than twice the near-average stocks a year earlier. Usually, disposition of the old crop is practically completed by July 1.

Three Government programs have helped to move 1950 crop apples. Under the export-payment program about 2.35 million bushels of fresh apples had been exported by June 16, 1951. An additional 2.9 million bushels had gone to School Lunch and institutional outlets under the surplus-removal program.

The 1950-51 pack of canned applesauce set a new record of about 8.3 million cases, 24/2½'s, and the pack of canned apples, about 4.8 million cases, was also a record.

CONVENTION

C.M.&S.A. Convention Records

An 82-page "1951 Canners Convention Attendance Record" has been compiled by the Canning Machinery & Supplies Association and has been distributed to the membership of that association.

The publication lists the following groups of Convention delegates:

Canners—U. S., Hawaii, Canadian, Mexican, and overseas; miscellaneous food processors; freezers; pickle packers; preservers; university and government representatives; press and radio; and wholesale grocers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Defense	
Ban on inventory windfalls removed	263
Canners construction requirements sought	263
Crop loss allowances on cherries, apricots, peaches	263
Text of OPS interpretation of GOR 13	264
Stambaugh to assist on USDA defense programs	264
Maintenance, repair order	265
Congress	
House debates amendments to Defense Act of 1950	263
Statistics	
Annual fruit and vegetable pack bulletins mailed	263
1951 acreage of peas for canning	268
1951 canning acreages larger	268
Pimientos for processing	268
Lima beans for processing	268
Green peas for processing	268
Beets for canning	269
Canned meat report	269
Tomatoes for processing	269
Cabbage for kraut	269
Snap beans for processing	269
Estimated production of 1951 fruit crops	270
Standards	
Canned beans standards	266
Frozen spinach standards	266
Procurement	
USDA to buy peas, cherries	266
Labor	
Labor bill now law	268
Raw Products	
Is one spray effective to destroy corn insects?	267
Traffic	
Text of ICC general permits	267
Death	
Frank W. Douthitt	267
Convention	
C.M.&S.A. convention records	270